

**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council**  
**Marine Reserves Working Group**  
**Public Forum**  
**March 21, 2001**  
**6:30 p.m – 9:30 p.m.**  
**Fess Parker's Doubletree Resort, Santa Ynez Room**  
**633 East Cabrillo Boulevard**  
**Santa Barbara, California**

**SUMMARY**

---

**In Attendance:**

**MRWG Members**

John Jostes – Facilitator  
Matt Pickett, Co-Chair  
Marla Daily  
Bob Fletcher  
Dale Glantz  
Greg Helms  
Deborah McArdle  
Tom Raftican

Dave Parker, alternate for Patty Wolf, Co-Chair  
Locky Brown  
Gary Davis  
Craig Fusaro  
Neil Guglielmo  
Mark Helvey  
Chris Miller  
Steve Roberson

**Sanctuary Staff** – Sean Hastings, Satie Airame, Laura Francis, Kathryn Hintergardt, Sarah Fangman, Ben Waltenberger, Michael Murray

**Department of Fish and Game Staff** – John Ugoretz, Paul Reilly

**Science Panel members** - Dan Reed, Steve Schroeter, Steve Gaines, Dan Richards and Joan Roughgarden.

**Socioeconomic Panel members** – Bob Leeworthy, Peter Wiley, Carrie Pomeroy

**SAC members** - Melissa Miller Henson-CA Resources Agency, Bruce Steele and Eric Hooper, Fishing Representatives, Rudy Scott – Business representative, Roberta Cordero-Public At-large member.

**Audience - Approximately 350 in attendance - including sport-divers, recreational fishermen, students, commercial fishermen, environmentalists and general public.**

---

## **OVERVIEW**

Matt Pickett, Sanctuary Manager, welcomed the public and discussed what the meeting was about, and highlighted that no decisions regarding reserves had been made.

Marine Reserves Working Group members introduced themselves.

John Jostes, MRWG facilitator, reviewed the handout on the purpose of the public forum, described the MRWG intent in receiving public input on four reserve options via small round table discussions and laid out general ground rules for interacting with one another. He added that the public comment period is on going throughout the process.

Neil Guglielmo added that he was glad to see everyone turnout and he is looking for creative solutions to assist the MRWG in making a good recommendation.

### **General Audience questions**

- Do submitted written comments carry the same weight?

Response – Yes

-Is there a specific internet site for more information?

Response – Yes, go to [www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov](http://www.cinms.nos.noaa.gov), it is referenced in the public forum handout.

-Who ultimately decides?

Response - MRWG recommendation is forwarded to the Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC), the SAC will forward it to the Sanctuary manager, who will then present a recommendation with the Department of Fish and Game, to the California Fish and Game Commission (FGC).

-Who gets all of the grant money for the conservation?

-If marine reserves are put into place are they no use zones?

Response - No – marine reserves are defined as no take zones, catch and release would not be allowed in a marine reserve.

-How many in the audience are recreational fishermen? We are concerned about adequate representation in the process.

-When a decision is before the FGC, who decides beyond three miles? (Concern that there could be a disconnect between the agencies.)

Response – beyond three miles is federal jurisdiction, the Sanctuary is working with the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) to coordinate efforts.

-Can the boundaries be rotated?

Response - Rotation is an idea that has been discussed by the MRWG.

Is there a financial commitment?

Matt Pickett - CINMS will commit to the extent possible, but the budget is decided annually.

Dave Parker – funding needs have been identified, enforcement is part of on-going effort, but is hard to forecast the future, enforcement is a priority.

CA Resources Agency – we can't make a request for something that doesn't exist, when we know what we are doing, we approach the legislature and governor to get the dollars.

Do you have a dollar figure yet so the public knows what to expect?

Agency Response - No, budget is not identified yet.

Is there a no action (status quo) alternative?

Response - Environmental review will require a no action alternative. The four reserve options allow us to get more ecological, economic and public information.

Chris Miller – funding is an important issue, we expect there to be administration contingencies. The idea of a sunset clause that if funding is not there the reserve is not there has been discussed. We all want accountability from management. The commercial fishermen are not comforted by an initiative being born on their backs. There is a reason to start with a reasonable reserve and based on administration and performance standards add reserve areas. Anacapa reserve has not been analyzed. This is a forum to be constructive; this is not the protest forum.

Marla Daily - as a representative of the public at large we need to know what you think. She then reviewed the Memorandum on public comments to date.

Of the six thousand comments supporting reserves, how many come from this region? And are not an email forwarded based on misinformation?

On the signatory list of NCEAS, what are the credentials of the signers?

Eric Hooper – Urged the public to get constructive with comments.

If you are against closures raise your hands!

How many representatives represent commercial interests?

Chris Miller– this process started with the FGC and conservation groups. He mentioned the Clinton Marine Protected Area Executive Order and added that CINMS became stakeholders and the Sanctuary thinks that the whole country has a stake in the Channel Islands. This is not what the FGC wanted us to do – go to the FGC and tell them you don't want them – otherwise get constructive tonight.

Greg Helms – Provided general explanations of the Sanctuary program, the definition of marine reserves and the makeup of the MRWG.

Chris Miller – We have a problem as Northern Channel Islands representatives in representing interest around Santa Barbara Island, we need to hear from San Pedro fishermen because we have not had access to those communities. I am not comfortable making a decision without hearing from them. Please let us know how the process could be better. We have done a good job to represent the small boat fleet, but we need a consensus, we will not implement a bogus deal that takes somebody down.

**Break** - Audience formed into smaller groups around the tables and began discussions with individual MRWG members and agency staff, there was a note taker at every table.

### **Reserve Design Issues**

- Boundaries need to be clearly marked or easily recognizable, there is concern about knowing position in the sanctuary relative to the reserves.
- Reserves should be rotated on a spatial and temporal scale.
- Reserves should be implemented with a sunset clause where the continued existence would be success based.

- Reserve design should include phasing of reserves based on meeting certain success criteria.
- Reserve size should be limited, i.e. 6 square miles in each zone.
- Reserve areas will force extra pressure on unprotected areas.
- Reserves should address sustainability of fisheries.
- Santa Barbara Island should be excluded from the reserve design, allow free diving.
- How did CINMS determine which reserve areas are better for reserve status?
- Habitat in reserves should be based on criteria valued by the vulnerability of the species.
- Consider closing one whole island vs. many small portions.
- Close San Miguel, nobody fishes it anyway.
- Anacapa is too degraded already, leave it out of the reserve system.
- Remove the shallow areas from all reserves to accommodate sport fishing.
- Put the reserves closer together, it is easier to get around or across them, and conserves fuel.
- Consider reserves in areas that aren't good anchorages, safe harbor.

#### **Reserve Administration – funding, enforcement, management**

- Where will the funding for the reserves come from, who is paying for this?
- Will money for the reserves be closely monitored?
- Is there adequate funding available if reserves are implemented?
- Will funding be sufficient to provide the necessary resources for management and enforcement, especially a larger reserve design?
- What concessions can be made for transiting the reserves with game on board? What about anchoring in a reserve with game on board, or seeking safe harbor with game on board?
- Management should be adaptive and flexible, with changes made to reflect new information and measures of success.
- Reserves can supply the necessary data for future management decisions.

- Maintain citizens advisory group in oversight of sanctuary and reserves.
- Need to implement a buoy and mooring system to minimize anchor damage.
- Consider redirecting fishing effort to ecotourism and research.
- Can you determine who and where the 6000 comments received thus far are from?
- Education for the public should be considered about where, why, & how.

### **Science Panel Recommendation**

- Where is the data for the recommendation coming from?
- Is this information unbiased, objective, and fair?
- Is the data provided current enough to allow for sound decision making (in regards to reserve placement)?
- Consider data collection on spear fishing vs. SCUBA diving impacts.
- Can you determine how much of the current natural resource depletion is from natural causes?
- Science should be able to justify reserves over time or they should be closed.

### **Fisheries Management**

- Will traditional management continue? Fisheries management should be adjusted to reflect the incorporation of reserves into the management regime.
- Eliminate weekend closures for squid if reserves are implemented.
- Pelagics should be exempt from no take in reserves due to their migratory life history.
- Will catch and release be considered in the reserves?
- Species specific reserves with stricter regulations should be considered before reserves.
- Traditional management should be allowed to work without reserves.
- Use traditional management with more regulations vs. implementing reserves.

- Gill nets and trawling should be banned entirely.
- Spearfishing should be allowed in reserves.
- Why deny legitimate fisheries when poachers will still assault the fishery.
- Use permit regulation of fisheries as management.
- Discourage large scale fishing efforts.
- Consider seeding depleted areas with new stock, i.e. aquaculture resources.
- Current DF&G regulations achieve close to 50% closure.
- Fish stocks need to be allowed to increase to over half of the original stock.

### **Social & Economic Considerations**

- What compensation has been considered for displaced fisherman?
- Preferential treatment should not be given to any one special fishing interest.
- Need more information on the impacts of reserves on recreational fishery and private boaters, they are not well represented with current data. As well as data for charter, sport, and dive boats.
- There is concern for the local fishing community competing with the international fishing community for the resources available with reserves in place.
- A cost benefit analysis and a history of fisheries collapse are needed for decision making.
- Closures may have far reaching tax problems with loss of revenues.

### **Other Management Issues**

- Consider artificial reefs and reef enhancement as part of the management plan.
- Reserves do not address the issues of pollution, loss of wetland habitat, and population pressures that are also affecting the sanctuary.
- Need to address bird conservation issues in reserves.
- Restoration must be part of the plan.

### **Miscellaneous**

- The precautionary approach is supported.
- Personal freedoms are being impinged upon with the implementation of reserves.
- Reserves are only benefiting scientists.
- Abalone is an indicator of ecosystem health.
- Concern seems to be focused on economic future not on population extinction.
- No take zones have real benefits.
- Ecosystems do not adhere to boundaries made by man.
- 90% of the fish are in 10% of the ocean.

## **2. Comments by Reserve Options**

### **Option A**

- Looks good. Don't wait. Great for sustainability, Best map for conservation and environment. The best to achieve long term success. Science based, research strongly supports concept A. Support science panel 30-50% minimum. 30-50% still only sustains 75% biodiversity, so it should definitely be the minimum. Anything above 30% is needed to preserve or increase the marine life.
- Need large area for conservation. Protects marine species and will reverse decline. These closures are adequate even for sensitive species. Large closures equal more fish.
- Good job in protecting habitat. Covers diverse areas. More focus on specific ecosystems.
- Support large start, then reduce when appropriate.
- Not good for monitoring- not many Kelp Forest Monitoring sites outside reserve areas.



- Economically not viable for any fisheries. May bring socio-economic impacts that are irrevocable. Will put 90-100% of fisherman out of business. State would need to buy out fishermen. Benefits do not justify the costs.
- Support is conditional on not putting people out of work. What will happen to fisherman if "A" is implemented?
- Related businesses along the coast would cease to exist.
- Price of fish would double for the public i.e. all fish would need to be imported.
- Could work if allow pelagic spearfishing within the reserve.
- Covers primary fishing areas and most productive ones. Takes away all sportfishing areas. Unacceptable would eliminate recreational as well as commercial fishing, too extreme. Disapprove- total closure for pelagics and sportfishing for pelagics. Spearfishermen would cease to exist.
- Starting with "A" will lead to reserves spreading to the coast.
- Would create increased pressure on other/open areas, that would be depleted overnight.
- Too big and not enough money to enforce, too large to manage or enforce or monitor.
- If adopted then might as well close the whole area.
- "A" is already a half way compromise (50%).
- Restricts halibut fishing (last 10% of halibut grounds).
- Does not adequately address the issues that are causing the problems.
- Too broad, should only be certain species, should only close rock cod areas.
- ATROCITY!

### **Option B**

- Strong research support for concept B, good spillover.
- Takes away too much. Removes good areas, leaving not good areas. Too big, too expensive

- B is better for Anacapa Island.
- Better than A, but still too large.
- Second choice to concept A
- Unacceptable, too much Santa Cruz Island backside “squid country”, a lot of sport areas.
- Too much economic impact/livelihood. 80% +/- of fish are within closure area.
- Good for black sea bass, increases value (larger fish) of remaining fishery.
- North side of Santa Rosa should not be included, good fishing ground.
- Will eliminate commercial fishing fleet. Economically may be taking more than 30%.
- Talcott Shoal should be in reserve (not included in B, but in A).
- San Miguel needs more closures on NW end, take out closure on N side.
- Need to put Richardson’s Rock (Harris Point east) back in.
- Looks realistic with education and enforcement.
- More than 30% no take up to 100 %.
- Too small.
- Unenforceable.
- Some divers/fishers in favor of this.
- Good choice. Fair balance. Will rebuild stocks.
- Concessions to commercial and sporties are made. Allows for some fishing.
- Concerns regarding Gull Island, recreational fishing.
- Not economically viable. Cost is too high for commercial guys.
- Compensate fishermen and support businesses.
- Already as low as it should go.
- Meets science panel recommendations, accomplishes all goals, balanced. Good science.

- B option reserves are big enough. Distributed evenly to create a network. Great locations with respect to currents and flow. Covers more types of area and large enough to have an effect.
- Worst map.
- Represents good faith effort for everyone involved.
- Spillover will not help recreational fishing.
- Will end urchin fisheries, urchins will destroy the kelp.
- Reasonable compromise between fishing and conservation.
- Some habitats are under represented. Wrong areas, should be at better places.
- Needs more transition zone, more California zone, more rocky intertidal, more eelgrass and more sand beach habitats.
- 50% of fisheries will be impacted.
- Could work if pelagic spearfishing is allowed.

### **Option C**

- Could work with pelagic spear fishing.
- Minimum to achieve long term success. Minimum closure area.
- Too large.
- Closure on Santa Barbara Island should be N 30' inside 120'.
- If reserves are imminent, concept C is ok by commercial fisher.
- C is maximum closure for squid fishers or they will be out of business.
- C best alternative.
- Start with C, then re-evaluate after 10 years.
- Closes off areas to fishing for non-endangered species.
- Better than B.
- Meets minimum science panel requirements.

- Too small, does not accomplish science recommendation.
- Can add more areas that fishermen do not use.
- Workable for all fishermen.
- Enough area to show if resources work, while leaving areas for fishing.
- Want something between C and D.
- O.k. as compromise.
- More south Santa Rosa Island west out of Johnson's Lee.
- Do not close Santa Barbara Island.
- Could live with it. Offers sufficient biodiversity, sound science, and is manageable.
- Good probability of acceptance.
- Should have more in middle islands, less emphasis on San Miguel and Anacapa.
- The lowest we can go.
- A & B are better.
- Santa Rosa & San Miguel need to be totally open, close both ends.
- Make larger but fewer areas.
- Does not make sense ecologically.
- Habitats not represented. Not enough habitat protection, near shore in particular.
- Strongly opposed.
- O.k. for urchin fishery.
- Make exception for squid.
- Would not function as a network.

**Option D**

- Something between Options C and D would be acceptable.
- Spearfishers might support D.

- Good concept, use as trial to see how it will work, add limited impact zones. Start small, then bigger after more study.
- Not big enough for protection or reproduction. Does not accomplish anything. Cannot accomplish the purpose of a reserve. Does nothing, inadequate, no merit.
- Closes fishing for several species not endangered.
- Will not work biologically or politically. No positive conservation effect. Not big enough, too small.
- D is the only option (no others), best proposal, and least impact.
- More manageable because fewer locations, enforceable, looks good.
- Lacks biodiversity. Too far below science panel threshold.
- Good because no anchorage or transit problems.
- Acceptable only because it is the smallest option.
- Poorly placed with respect to currents.
- Commercial fishermen could not live with it.
- Too small for conservation goals, ineffective for fishing goals. Makes a mockery out of the word reserves.
- Will put both fish and fishermen out of business.
- Difficult to enforce.
- Least intrusive, most acceptable.
- Won't work, why bother.
- Least expensive.
- Wouldn't prove anything (too small).
- Would not demonstrate long term benefits.
- Good test for pelagics.
- Favored for squid.

- No shoreline for Oregonian and Californian Provinces.

### **3. Written Comments submitted to the Public Comment Box**

Opposed to Reserves - 19

ISupport of Reserves - 19

Support for Specific Reserve Options

Option A- 8

Option B- 9

Option C- 2

Option D- 2

### **Questions/ Comments**

- General questions regarding funding for enforcement, monitoring and adaptive management
- Sunset provision of reserves in 5 years
- Before reserves initiated... want to see secure funding, reduce effort before reserves created; establish performance criteria; sunset clauses.
- Restrict or ban commercial mining first.
- Proposal by one to work on kelp restoration projects at selected sites.
- Rights of freedivers should be considered; want to spear pelagic fish within no-take zones.
- Comment about the areas not in reserves being hurt more when no-take zones are in place.
- Smallest reserves in areas where weather and remoteness inhibit access; suggests limited or no-take on "local" slow growers including rockfish and calico bass; want reserves on the Northern End of Santa Barbara Island only.
- Gull Island should not be a reserve; Johnson's Lee should be exempt at Santa Rosa.
- What will the squid fishery management plan do about the fleet/fishery if areas are closed?
- Other avenues looked into such as artificial reefs.
- Compensation issues and open areas overfished.

- Closure to recreational fishermen; seasonal closures, lower limits, catch and release, no commercial fishing.
- A, B and C hurt the Condor fishing grounds around San Miguel Island; and D is too minimal.
- Wants a small start of no-take reserves. Where did the data come from and over how long was it studied?
- Recreational and commercial fishing should be distinguished from each other.
- Be specific and rotate reserves; seasonal closures and size limits, slot limits, artificial reefs.
- Are we operating with the sanction of the Department of Interior? Does congressional approval govern the final OK? What does CA Fish and Game have to do with federal disputes?
- Catching schooling fish are not endangered, so why in no-take zones?
- Concept C does not cover enough shore species. Concept B should include Forney Cove. If another concept other than A decided, then cannot call a reserve.
- Want to decrease the number of reserves and plant kelp; need to monitor the effectiveness.
- Public seat individuals... need someone with a true spirit for the public and not courting own interest; Craig Fusaro is a liaison for oil and fishing industry.
- Recreational angling should not be held accountable for reductions.
- Reduce limit size and create slot limits; recreational and commercial fishermen should be separated.
- Should start with smaller closures first and monitor them.
- Should reduce the number of commercial fishermen with the minimum closure possible.
- What if a drift net gets into a no-take zone?
- Minimum reserves with maximum monitoring and data evaluation needed; rotate more in if they work.
- Marla and Craig...How can you claim to represent the public at large when you side with the small minority of public input? The public at large (6000 +) should send you a very clear message.
- Sport fishery should not be subject to no-take zones.
- Grandfathering in some of the current licenses; no new permits issued and attention to island areas with seabird rookeries.

- The public seats are filled with biased individuals.
- Socio-economic study incomplete to recreational uses.
- Stop all commercial fishing within the Santa Barbara Marine Sanctuary.